

**REMARKS**

The following remarks are provided in response to the Final Office Action (“office action”) mailed November 26, 2007 in which the office action:

- rejected claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by US patent 7,134,138 to Scherr (hereinafter Scherr) and further in view of US patent 7,194,762 to Challener et al. (hereinafter Challener).

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

**Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Scherr in view of Challener.

Independent claims 1 and 9, from which claims 2, 4-8, 10 and 12-16 depend, include the element, “*communicating the delegate owner token, but not the master owner token, to the delegated environment.*” (See specification p. 6, lines 24-26; p. 7, line 23 – p. 8, line 16.) Independent claim 17, from which claims 18 and 20 depend, recites a similar element. The office action relies on Scherr to disclose that “host tokens (delegate owner token) are distributed and used to identify and authenticate host computers (delegated environment).” (See office action, p. 4, third paragraph.) However, Scherr fails to disclose “communicating the delegate owner token, but not the master owner token, to the delegated environment.” The office action incorrectly states that, in Scherr, “the master token is not communicated to the host computers but the host tokens are

distributed to the host environment.” (See office action, p. 4, third paragraph.) The office action does point to a portion of Scherr that discloses using “a master token [] to identify and authenticate a data access manager that creates and distributes [] host tokens used to identify and authenticate host computers.” (See Scherr, col. 5, lines 50-53.) However, it is important to note that the office action points to a portion of Scherr that is silent with respect to communicating the master token. Scherr goes on to disclose, with respect to the same embodiment, that both the master token and the host token are, in fact, communicated to the host environment. For example, Scherr states,

“In step **104**, the data access manager **28** *communicates the master token 42 to the hosts 22* . . . . In step **106**, the data access manager **28** communicates the host tokens **43** to the hosts **22**.” (Emphasis added.) (See Scherr, col. 8, lines 1-33, and corresponding Figure 2.)

Thus, **Scherr discloses communicating both a master token and a host token to a host**, whereas **the Applicants teach and claim “communicating the delegate owner token, but not the master owner token, to the delegated environment.”**

The office action relies on Challenger merely to disclose a system that “comprises a security chip, such as a Trusted Platform Module.” (See office action, p. 4, final paragraph – p. 5, first paragraph.) As such, Challenger fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Scherr. Thus, **neither Scherr nor Challenger, alone or in combination, disclose “communicating the delegate owner token, but not the master owner token, to the delegated environment,”** as taught and claimed by the Applicants.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20.

**CONCLUSION**

The applicants submit that they have overcome the office action's rejections of the claims and that they have the right to claim the invention as set forth in the listed claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicant(s) hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, L.L.P.

January 28, 2008

Date

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
Telephone: (503) 439-8778  
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073

/Justin K. Brask/

Justin K. Brask  
Reg. No. 61,080